A

DEFENCE

OF THE

RESOLUTION

OF

THIS CASE,

VIZ.

Whether the Church of *England*'s Symbolizing ſo far as it doth with the Church of *Rome*, makes it Unlawfull to hold Communion with the Church of *England*.

In Anſwer to a Book Intituled

A Modeſt Examination

OF THAT

RESOLUTION.

By Edward Fowler, D.D. Bishop of Gloucester

LONDON,

Printed by *J. H.* for *B. Aylmer*, at the *Three Pigeons*, againſt the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhill*. 1684.

(1) 52 D.

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

Reſolution, &c.

SIR,

I who know the Author of the Book, which hath given you this trouble, better than any man, do conclude that *you* are not more a ſtranger to *him*, than *he* is to *you*, from the Epithets you ſo frequently beſtow upon him throughout your Papers; except you do it (which I would not be ſo uncharitable as to think) by way of Irony.

In your *Firſt* Paragraph you expreſs a Liking of the Complexion of his Book; and I perceive you mean, that it pleaſeth you to find it not written in a heat, and that there is nothing of a Cenſorious or Peeviſh humour, or of a haughty contempt of thoſe he deals with, therein expreſt. And he hopes that upon the ſame accounts, you are no leſs pleaſed with the *other Reſolutions of Caſes*, which bear *this* company. But he thinks it no *mighty* Attainment, to be able in *writing* to manage a Controverſie Coolly and Sedately; without bitter or provoking

Reflexions, or contemptuous Expreſſions. Though men of warm Tempers may find it ſomewhat difficult, to govern their Spirits and Paſſions, as it becomes them, in the heat of diſputing by *word of mouth*; one would think that a ſmall meaſure of *Humility* or *Good nature*, or of *Diſcretion* and *Prudence*, ſhould make it no hard matter to acquire that *other* Attainment: And, much more, that no one who is a *Chriſtian* in Spirit and Temper, as well as in *Notion* and *Profeſſion*, can find it a difficult thing to arrive at it. But enough of *this*.

In your *Second* Paragraph, you ſeem to intimate, that our Author might have ſpared his pains in dwelling ſo long upon the Diſtance between *our* Church and the Church of *Rome*, in points of *Doctrine*: But he is not ſatisfied with the *reaſons* you give for the needleſneſs of ſo doing. Your reaſons are two; Firſt, becauſe *he argued chiefly for Communion in* Worſhip. And Secondly, *you never met with the Doctrinal part of the* 39 *Articles charged as Popiſh, nor our Church reflected on, as ſymbolizing with that Idolatrous Church, in Points of Doctrine.* But theſe reaſons have not convinced our Author, that he is over long upon *this* Argument; for it was not his deſign to ſhew, that *our* Church doth not ſymbolize in Points of Doctrine with that of *Rome*, but that She ſtands at greateſt *defyance* with that Church: Not, that She doth not *teach* her Corrupt Doctrine in her Articles; but that ſhe deſignedly *confutes* them, and expoſeth the falſity and corruption of them. And *this* ſurely was worth the ſhewing in ſo many inſtances, for *their* ſakes who never read or conſidered thoſe Articles; as I fear very few of the *Diſſenters* have done.

And, whereas you ſay, you *never met with the Doctrinal part of the* 39 *Articles charged as Popiſh* (and it would be ſtrange if you had) I ſay, there is too great cauſe to ſuſpect, that very few of our Diſſenting Brethren do underſtand

derſtand how *Anti-popiſh* they are, though they do not charge them as *Popiſh*. And I doubt you have met with many. (I am ſure *very* many are to be met with) who have reflected upon our Church as an *Idolatrous* Church, though you never heard her accuſed as ſymbolizing with the Idolatrous Church of *Rome*, in Points of *Doctrine*. But they will find it ſomewhat hard to underſtand, how a Church can be Idolatrous in matters of *Practice*, and yet be pure in her *Doctrine* from any tang of Idolatry. Surely her *Practices* muſt be grounded upon her *Doctrines*, or they would be *ſtrange* Practices indeed. And it would be wonderfull, if ſhe ſhould *Practiſe* Idolatry, and yet *Believe* nothing that tends to the encouragement of that foul Sin; nay believe and teach all thoſe Doctrines that are as Oppoſite to Idolatry, as Light to Darkneſs. So that I conceive nothing could be more to our Author's purpoſe, than to endeavour to remove that prejudice of many, againſt the Conſtitution of our Church, which is grounded upon an Opinion of its being near of kin to Popery. And what could ſignifie more to their Conviction, that there is not any ground for ſuch an Opinion, than the ſhewing how abhorrent to Popery our Church is in her *Doctrine*; and what a teſtimony ſhe beareth in her Articles againſt the Idolatrous and Superſtitious Doctrines of the *Romiſh* Church, and the *Practices* which ſhe foundeth upon thoſe Doctrines?

As to the ſeveral Additions you ſay may be made to the * Anti-popiſh Doctrines contained in the 39 *Articles*, our Author conceives he was not guilty of any Overſight in not preventing you, becauſe ſome of them are not properly *Anti-popiſh*, but contrary to the Doctrine of other Sects, which are to be found among *Abhorrers* of Popery as well as *Papiſts*; and others of them our Author hath *not* omitted, but if you'll look again, you may find them in their proper places. *Viz.*

* *pag.* 4.

Viz. thoſe Doctrines contained in Artic. VI. and Artic. XI. *This*, under the head of Doctrines *flatly contradicting the Holy Scriptures*, pag. 9. *That*, under the head of *the Authority on which each of the two Churches founds its whole Religion*, pag. 18.

Now I hope by this time, you underſtand very well *what our Author would have you conclude*, from this firſt part of his Performance, which you ſay * *you do not well underſtand.* * *pag.* 4.

And whereas you ask, *whether it be that the* 39 *Articles have in them nothing of kin to Popery, as to matters of Faith?* And add *that you dare ſay, there is not a judicious Diſſenter in* England *will ſay they have.* I anſwer, if there be any *injudicious* Diſſenters in *England*, that will ſay they have, I hope theſe poor people ought not to be ſo deſpiſed, as that we ſhould uſe no means for the undeceiving of them. But our Author would have you conclude, that he hath *done* what he *deſigned*, which is (as hath been already ſaid) not to ſhew that the 39 Articles have *nothing of kin* to Popery, but that they are *moſt abhorrent* from it; and that our Church is at the *wideſt and vaſteſt* diſtance from Popery in her *Doctrinals*; and conſequently one would think too, in matters of *Practice*. But our Author does not ſatisfie himſelf to prove this by *this* conſequence; but goes on to ſhew it in the particular inſtances of matters of *Practice*, after he had done it in Points of *Doctrine*.

To *return* now to your *Second* Page, *You ſay that it is mightily Satisfactory to you to hear our Author aſſuring you, that our Church alloweth her Members the judgment of Diſcretion*, &c. But, Sir, you needed no Authors to aſſure you of *this*, ſince our Church hath done it as fully, as it can be done by words; and our Author no otherwiſe aſſures you of it, than by citing our Churches Articles. But whereas you add, that *this you cannot but think implieth a Liberty, not onely to* Believe *and* Judge, *but to* Doe *alſo*

alſo according to what a man believes and judgeth; ſurely you will find your ſelf able to think *otherwiſe*, when you have conſidered, what is the neceſſary and immediate conſequence of ſuch a thought, *viz.* that all ſuch things as *Laws* are utterly inconſiſtent with allowing to men the *Judgment of Diſcretion*, according to this large notion: And that, therefore our Church doth *faultily* Symbolize with the Church of *Rome*, in having any ſuch things as *Government* and *Diſcipline*.

You next ſay, *that our Author ſpeaketh very true as to the Popiſh Rites and Ceremonies, and that thoſe in our Church are comparatively few; but you much doubt, whether the uſe of thoſe few was long before Popery appeared in the world, unleſs he means Popery at its full growth; for that Myſtery of Iniquity, as to Rituals, began to work very early.* To this I anſwer, that the *Papiſts* may con you great thanks for this paſſage, it plainly enough intimating that the Primitive Fathers and Chriſtians were for the moſt part *Papiſts*, though not *fully grown* Papiſts. And as to thoſe words of St. *Paul*, *The Myſtery of iniquity doth already work*, if you can do any thing *like* proving that the Apoſtle meant by the *Myſtery of iniquity*, *which began to work in his days*, the uſe of ſuch Rites as thoſe you are offended with in *our* Church, I will engage for our Author, that he ſhall immediately ſet up for a *Nonconformiſt*.

You ſay in your *Third* Page, that *you cannot well underſtand how our Author ſaith, that our Church doth not impoſe her Rites as neceſſary, unleſs he means as neceſſary in order to Salvation*, &c. But doth he not expreſly tell you what he means by *neceſſary*? you found he did, if you read the whole Sentence, which runs thus, *pag.* 4. *And ſhe impoſeth her Rites not* (as the Church of *Rome* does *her's*) *as neceſſary, and as parts of Religion, but as merely indifferent and changeable things*, as we find in her 34*th* Ar-

Article, &c. And why, Sir, did you conceal *this* part of the Sentence, and thus ſtop at a *Comma* ?

You thus proceed ; *Nor do I well underſtand how they are not made neceſſary to Salvation, when the non-obſervance of them is made ſinfull, and meritorious of a being caſt out of the Church*, &c. And I aſſure you, that I do as little underſtand, if this be good arguing, how whatſoever the King commands of his Subjects , or a Maſter of his Servants, is not made by them *neceſſary to Salvation*, ſince the non-obſervance of the Lawfull Commands of each, is acknowledged to be *ſinfull*, by all that believe *theſe* Precepts binding , *viz. Submit your ſelves to every Ordinance of man, for the Lord's ſake*, &c. And, *Servants obey in all things your Maſters*, &c. And as to the Penalty you mention, of *being caſt out of the Church, and cut off from the Body of Chriſt*, which is the ſame thing, it amounts to *thus* much ; That thoſe who will by no means be prevailed with, to conform to the Laws of the Society of which they are Members, ſhall be caſt out of it : which all Societies and Bodies Politique whatſoever, have ever thought fit to have inflicted, upon obſtinate Tranſgreſſors of their Laws, in order to the preſervation of themſelves , and the upholding of Government amongſt them. And our Author I am certain will readily grant, that none but *Obſtinate* Tranſgreſſors of the Churches Laws, and ſuch as are incorrigible by all other means firſt tryed, ought to be caſt out of the Church, and that the Sentence of Excommunication ſhould never be pronounced againſt them, but as the laſt Remedy : As alſo that the deſign thereof ought always to be the *Reformation* of the Offender (as well as for example to others) never his *Deſtruction*. But how does *this* Penalty's being made the Sanction of the Laws of our Church, which ordain Rites and Ceremonies for Order's ſake , and the decent adminiſtration of Divine Worſhip in Publique, ſpeak theſe to be enjoyned

as

as *neceſſary to Salvation*, when the non-obſervance of any of them is no otherwiſe judged to be ſinfull, than as it is an Act of diſobedience to *Humane* Authority; and when this Penalty is never (according to the Rules of our Church) to be inflicted, but in caſe of the Offender's adding *contempt* to his *diſobedience?* If any inſtances can be given of perſons being Excommunicated upon the account of Nonconformity, who are humble and modeſt and peaceable, and that give good evidence of their willingneſs to comply with the Laws of their Governours as far as they are able with ſafe conſciences, this I am ſure is wholly the fault of *Perſons*, not of our *Conſtitution.* But this Objection is too inconſiderable to deſerve our beſtowing ſo many words upon it.

All that follows to the bottom of your *Fifth* Page, wherein our Author is concerned, hath been replied to: And *there* you thus ſpeak. *As in* England *we have a* Silent *and a* Speaking *Law, ſo we have alſo a* Silent *and a* Speaking *Church*, &c. *We know the Doctrine of the* Church of England *in the* 39 *Articles; but this is but* Eccleſia Muta: *How many have we that will tell us, We are* Eccleſia Loquens, the Living *Church of* England; *and we tell you*, &c. Here follow no fewer than *thirteen* Doctrines *taught by this* Eccleſia Loquens, *contradictory to the* 39 *Articles.* But

1. You have given us (we thank you) the very *firſt* information of this *Eccleſia Loquens:* But why do you expect, unleſs we knew you better, that we ſhould take your bare word for it? Nay we have hardly *that*, for you do not in expreſs terms *affirm*, but ask *this Queſtion, How many have we that will tell us, we are* Eccleſia Loquens? And therefore it might ſuffice, to give you onely this ſhort anſwer, Do you tell us how *many*, or whether there are *any*, if you know. Surely this Church of yours is an *Inviſible Church*; or, if not, none but *Diſſen-*

ters Eyes are clear enough to get the leaſt glympſe of it. But the truth of it is, 'tis a mere *Figment*, and the very *Dream of a Shadow.* But

2. Whereas a *Poſitive Aſſertion* of the being of *ſuch* a Church of *England* is *implied* in this Queſtion, you cannot well be otherwiſe underſtood, than as aſſerting, that the Prevailing party of our *Church of England Divines*, have obtruded upon the World this long Beadroll of Hereſies, as Articles of Faith; and ſo have turned the *Old* Church of *England* out of doors: And therefore you are brought to this miſerable paſs, that you cannot hold Communion with this *New* Church, except you will ſeparate from, and bid adieu to the *Old.* And, in good earneſt, if *this* be *ſo*, Diſſenters are the *onely* true Friends of the Church of *England*, as by Law Eſtabliſhed; and *this* Church is hugely *obliged* to them for their Separation. But

3. I am well aſſured, that you will never be able to make good this charge, or any part of it, againſt any number of the Divines of our Church. For I who know, I am confident, as many of them, as moſt men in *England*, can truly declare as followeth,

That I cannot name any one Divine of our Church, who teacheth your *Firſt* contradictory Doctrine to the 39 Articles, *viz. That although we may not terminate our worſhip in an Image, yet we may bow down and worſhip the true God before an Image.*

Nor your *Second*, viz. *That departed Saints know our ſtates here upon Earth, and are praying to God for us; and therefore we may pray to them.*

Nor know I any one of our Church, who teacheth your *Third*, viz. *That any Prieſt may abſolve, by commiſſion from God, more than declaratively.* I mean, I know no one that maketh the Prieſt's Abſolution to be other in *Effect* than declarative, though it ſignifies more than if pronounced by a Layman.

Nor

Nor your *Fourth*, *That the Natural Body and Bloud of Chriſt, is in the Elements of Bread and Wine really.* Our *Church-Catechiſm* ſaith that, *The Body and Bloud of Chriſt, are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithfull in the Lord's Supper:* And I know no Divine of ours that explaineth this otherwiſe than *thus*, That Believers feed on the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, in the Lord's Supper, as *truly* and *really* as they do on the Elements; but not after a *corporal* and *carnal* manner, but after a *ſpiritual*, viz. by applying to themſelves the Benefits of Chriſt's death by faith. And I preſume you will neither aſſert this to be *Popiſh* Doctrine, nor deny that 'tis *true* Doctrine.

Nor do I know any one of our Divines that holds your *Fifth* Propoſition, for it may not be called a Doctrine, *viz. That our Conformable Congregations are no better than Conventicles, where the Miniſter reads not the Communion Service at the Altar.* Which you aſſert to be tantamount to the *allowing of Prayers in an Unknown Tongue; becauſe in multitudes of Congregations, the People cannot hear a line from him.* I ſay, I know of no *Divine* of our Church, that ever aſſerted that *ſuch* Congregations as the forementioned, are no better than *Conventicles.* There was indeed lately a fooliſh Book publiſhed to Prove them Conventicles, but it is ſtrongly conjectured that *this* Book was written by a certain *Layman:* And *what* Church *he* is of I cannot ſay, nor is it a *pins* matter to know. But I may as much ſuſpect him to be a *Proteſtant* Diſſenter, as a *Popiſh*, upon the ſcore of that his Poſition; it being nothing of kin to the *allowing of Prayers in an Unknown tongue.* For (as there is not *One* of your *Multitudes* of Congregations, wherein the *People cannot hear a line from him* that reads at the Communion Table, except you mean, wherein *every one* of the People cannot; for, I doubt not, the Major part can in *all* where the Miniſter hath a voice to be well heard from the Pulpit, ſo) all that is read is

known *before* to thoſe who are not Strangers to our Prayers, or at leaſt they may have Books to enable them to go along with the Miniſter, whether they *can*, or *cannot* hear diſtinctly one ſentence from him.

Nor do I know any one of our Divines that hath ever taught your *6th* Doctrine, *That whole Chriſt is under each Element:* which you intimate is *the onely foundation on which the Sacrilegious* Romiſh *Practice ſtands.* But if I could believe that Doctrine to be true, I ſhould notwithſtanding judge it an intolerable thing to refuſe the Cup to the Laity, againſt the expreſs Inſtitution of our Lord.

Nor know I any Divine of our Church guilty of the *7th* particular of your Charge, *viz. That there are thoſe who interpret the Ten Commandments* ſo as *that he who will ever be ſaved muſt do a great many works of ſupererogation.* And if I did know any one that ſo interpreted the Commandments, as to make any *one* ſuch work neceſſary to Salvation, I would not call him a *Papiſt* for it, but an *Ignoramus*; who underſtands not the word *Supererogation.*

Nor know I any one that teacheth *Original Sin*, (thereby underſtanding *Corruption of Nature*) *to be rather our Misfortune than our Fault:* which is your *8th* Doctrine.

Nor conſequently, *that Concupiſcence is no ſin*; which is your *9th.*

Nor your *10th*, *That man hath a power in his own will to chuſe and doe what is ſpiritually good*; (i.e.) without the Aſſiſtence of Divine Grace: And *with* this Aſſiſtence I hope you Diſſenters do all hold it.

Nor know I any one of our Divines who teacheth, *That we are not accounted righteous before God* (or Juſtified) *onely for the Merits of Chriſt:* that is, that there is any other Meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification beſides the Active and Paſſive obedience of Chriſt.

Nor your *11th*, *That we are not Juſtified by Faith alone:*

Under-

Underſtanding by *Faith*, not a *dead* but a *living* Faith, that *pureſies the heart, and works by love.*

Nor your 12*th*, *That good works muſt go before juſtification, and are not the fruits of Faith, but Faith it ſelf.* For I know no one of our Church that aſſerts more than *this*, that a ſincere Reſolution to obey all God's Commandments muſt, in order of *nature*, go before Juſtification.

Nor your 13*th*, *That there is no Eternal Predeſtination of perſons to life, and the means tending thereunto.* I know of none of our Church that have ever taught this Doctrine, as you have expreſſed it; nor any worſe than *this*, *That Eternal Predeſtination* to life is not *Irreſpective* or *Abſolute*; which no Article of our Church ſaith it is. And Abundance of you *Diſſenters* hold this Doctrine, as well as *Church of England* men.

And thus have I gone over all the Doctrines contradictory to the 39 Articles, taught by your *Eccleſia Loquens*, *yours* I ſay, for ſhe is not *ours*; and I declare again, that I know of no Divine of our Church, that teacheth or holdeth ſuch Doctrines. If you know *any*, as one would think you do very *many*, I pray *name* them. You ſay, *we ſpare any names in theſe caſes*; but be you entreated *not* to ſpare them. But if you won't be prevailed with, we ſhall very ſhrewdly gueſs at the reaſon.

Sir, to deal freely with you, I cannot but wonder, at your adventuring into the World this other *Celeuſma*; ſince the Author of the former had ſo ill ſucceſs, and muſt needs have repented him heartily of that Undertaking. All that have conſiderately read his Anſwerer, I am confident are convinced, that after a *Great Cry*, *Little Wooll* appeared; or rather *none* at all. Nor can ſuch be ignorant, what *foul* play was uſed to make our Divines of the Church of *England* breach Hereſie. And I doubt not but *you* your ſelf have bluſhed at it, if you have ever

read

read the *Parallela imparia*; ſive *Specimen fidei Celeuſmaticæ*. Could you catch *us* thus dealing with the Books of *your* Authors, as *ours* have been dealt with by *that* Author, and ſome *others* that might be named, we ſhould at *another* kind of rate have been expoſed, than *they* have been.

But, Sir, for God's ſake, let us make as much Conſcience of vile Calumny, than which there is not a more expreſs Tranſgreſſion of the Law of God, nor of the very Light of Nature, as of Obedience to Authority in ſuch things as no Divine Law can be produced againſt; and nothing but ſtrained and far-fetcht Conſequences. And, for God's ſake alſo, let us at length be perſwaded to have ſo great a concern for our common *Religion*, as to give over expoſing it by ſuch unchriſtian doings, to the Scorn and Deriſion of our Common *Enemy*.

But I cannot take my leave of this heavy *Charge* of yours, till I have asked you, what you *inferr* from thence, on ſuppoſition you can make good proof of it? It is plain your deſign in all this talk, is to juſtifie, if not a *total*, yet a *partial* Separation. You do indeed (to conceal nothing of your Candour) after all acknow-

* *p.* 7. ledge, * *That you are very far from thinking that there are not multitudes of Holy and Learned men in our* Eccleſia Loquens, *that in theſe things are of another mind:* And therefore, I hope, you will not excuſe Separation from *their* Churches.

Nay you ſay, † *That hundreds of the* Speaking Church *are, as we believe, as far from ſymbolizing with*

† *p.* 9. *the Church of* Rome (you mean in Doctrine) *as the Articles; And that in this thing a Separation from the* Silent, *as well as this part of the* Speaking *Church, muſt needs be highly Sinfull.* And in thus declaring, you condemn the *generality* of thoſe that Separate; it being well known that Communion with thoſe whom you will acknowledge to be *Orthodox* Divines, and thoſe which you

you account *Heterodox*, is much alike boggled at. But I fear, when all is done, you condemn onely ſeparation in *Heart* from theſe *Orthodox* men; your Undertaking in your 8*th* Page makes me fear *this*; viz. *That all the Valuable perſons in* Presbyterian *and* Independent *Congregations, ſhall give any reaſonable aſſurance, that they are not in* Heart *divided from a Single Perſon, in the Church of* England, *that ſpeaketh in matters concerning* Doctrine, *as our Church doth in her* Articles: But if you think that all the Communion you are obliged to hold with *theſe* Divines, is onely that of the *Heart*; that is, *thinking* them Orthodox, and *loving* them as *ſuch*, but allow it to be lawfull, to refuſe to worſhip God with them, nay and not ſo much as to *hear* them, we thank you for nothing. This is ſuch Church Communion as will well conſiſt with rending and tearing the Church in pieces.

But I pray do not think that all this while I take it for *granted*, that 'tis lawfull to ſeparate from the Congregations of thoſe Divines whom we take to be in ſome points Heterodox. Nay upon ſuppoſition that *your Eccleſia Loquens* did as generally depart from the Doctrine of our Church, as the *Phariſees* in our *Saviour*'s time did from the *Law of Moſes*, I ſhall be far from granting that Separation from their Congregations is lawfull, except there be a conſtraint laid upon us to ſubſcribe to their Heterodox Opinions, till you can prove that our Saviour allowed of the *Jews* Separation from the *Phariſees*; which you never can, but the *contrary* who cannot ſhew? He bad his Diſciples indeed, *to beware of the Leaven of the Phariſees*; and ſo are *we* to beware of the *Leaven* of ſuch Heterodox Teachers; but not ſo to beware of it, as not to come within their Churches; for that *that* caution of our Saviour is not to be ſo interpreted, appears not onely from his own practice (who was far from being a Separatiſt from the Jewiſh *Temple* or *Synagogues*) and by what he ſaith, *Mat.* 23. 2, 3.

In

In the last Paragraph of your 9*th* Page, you return to speak more *directly* to our Author: And *first* you reflect upon *these* words in his Book, *p.* 24. *But I am so far from taking it for granted, that a Church is guilty of Sin in agreeing in some indifferent things with the Church of* Rome, *that I must needs profess, I have often wondered, how this should become a Question: Seeing whatsoever is of an indifferent nature, as it is not* commanded, *so neither is it* forbidden *by any Moral or Positive Law; and where there is no Law there is no Transgression*, &c. To *this* you say, that *it is an obvious begging the Question.* And it might be so, if our Author *stopt* here, but he *thus* proceeds: *And whereas certain circumstances will make things, that in themselves are neither Duties nor Sins, to be either Duties or Sins, and to fall by* Consequence, *under some Divine Command or Prohibition; I have admired how this Circumstance of an indifferent thing's being used by the Church of* Rome, *can be thought to alter the nature of that thing, and make it cease to be indifferent, and become sinfull.* So that *this* is the *Obvious* meaning of our Author's words, that he hath wondered how it should become a Question, whether a Church may lawfully agree in some things with the Church of *Rome*, which the Law of God hath not forbidden: And whereas some things that are not forbidden by the Law of God *directly*, are notwithstanding forbidden thereby *Consequentially*, he hath admired how the mere Circumstance of a thing's being *practised by the Church of* Rome, can speak it to be forbidden by God's Law *Consequentially.* And then he immediately betakes himself to the consideration of some of those Laws given to the *Israelites*, that prohibit their imitating the Doings of the *Egyptians* and *Canaanites*, which are urged by Nonconformists, to prove it unlawfull to imitate the Church of *Rome* in things of a mere indifferent nature, and that *that* circumstance of their being practised by

that

that Church makes them ceaſe to be indifferent, and to become Sinfull: And endeavours to ſhew, that *this* cannot with any ſhew of reaſon be gathered from *theſe* Laws.

And how, I pray, is *this* an *Obvious begging of the Queſtion?* which is, *Whether a Church's ſymbolizing, or agreeing in ſome things, with the Church of* Rome, *be a warrant for ſeparatian from the Church ſo agreeing? This,* I ſay, is the Queſtion which our Author handles.

But you next *make* a Queſtion for him, and ſay it is *this*, * *Whether a thing in its own nature indifferent, be ſtill indifferent as to Chriſtians uſe in God's worſhip, when it hath been once uſed in Idolatrous Services; if the uſe of it be neither* Naturally *neceſſary to the worſhip of God, as it is an* humane *Act, nor ſuitable to the Ends of it, nor ſuch without which it cannot in common judgment be decently performed?* But our Author much *more* wonders, how *this* ſhould become a Queſtion, than how that of his *own* propounding ſhould. For

* *p.* 10.

Firſt, There are *three* apparent Contradictions in it. It being a contradiction to ſay concerning the *ſame* thing, that it is in *its own nature indifferent*, and yet *naturally neceſſary to the Worſhip of God, as it is an humane Act.* It being *ſo* too, to ſay of the *ſame* thing, that 'tis *in its own nature indifferent*, and yet *Unſuitable to the Ends of Divine Worſhip.* It being a contradiction again, to ſay of the *ſame* thing, that *'tis in its own nature indifferent*, and yet *ſuch as without which the Worſhip of God cannot in common judgment be decently performed.* For you *muſt* mean by *things in their own nature indifferent*, things that *are ſo* in *Divine Worſhip*: for otherwiſe, you trifle egregiouſly in putting *this* Queſtion, or make your *Nonconformiſts* ſo to doe, for *whom* you put it. But you *abuſe* them, if you do ſo; for *that* which divers of them do aſſert, and which occaſioned our Author's *Reſolution of the Caſe of Symbolizing*, &c. is *this*; *That things which*

 might

might otherwiſe be lawfully uſed in the Worſhip of God, do become unlawfull, by their having been abuſed in Idolatrous or Superſtitious Services. And *ſome* of them do underſtand *this* in a more *limited* and *reſtrained* ſenſe (as our Author hath ſhewed) than *others* of them do.

Secondly, as this Queſtion is put, you are ſure to have no Adverſaries. For *who* ever doubted whether a thing be unlawfull in the Worſhip of God, that is *Unſuitable to the Ends thereof*, whether *this* thing hath been *abuſed* or *no* in Idolatrous Services?

Now, having thus ſtrangely put the Queſtion, you proceed to ſhew that from thence will follow ſeveral things, *as things out of controverſie betwixt us.* And I perceive you are very cautious herein of reviving a certain *Old* controverſie among *your ſelves*, viz. *Whether our Old Churches, Bells and Fonts*, &c. *may ſtill be uſed.* For you *thus* word your *third* particular wherein we are agreed, *viz. That things of mere conveniency for a Religious Action, for the Service of the Ends of it may be uſed, though Idolaters have uſed the like* (you are ſhy, I perceive, of ſaying the *ſame*) *ſo as none ſcruple the uſing of Churches to meet in*, &c. You ſay not, none ſcruple the uſing of the *Old Churches which were built by* Papiſts.

In your next Page, you tell our Author, * *p.* 11. that you think that, * Zanchy's *Rule is at leaſt Safeſt*, and *that he knows that, in dubiis animæ tutior pars eſt eligenda.* But I think you might have Engliſht it better than *thus*, *in matters of Sin, the Safeſt part is always to be preferred.* For *in matters of Sin*, or ſinfull matters, in my ſilly judgment, there is *no* ſafeſt part to be preferred.

Next you poſitively aſſert, that *in matters of Divine Worſhip, if the things uſed by Idolaters be not neceſſary, both the abuſe and the uſe alſo ought to be aboliſhed.* And you ſay, *you cannot underſtand what elſe is the meaning*

of

of the Apoſtle in that his Application of the words found, Pſal. 24. 1. in 1 Cor 10. 28. *viz. If any man ſay unto you, this is offered in Sacrifice unto Idols; Eat not, for his ſake that ſhewed it, and for Conſcience ſake: For the Earth is the Lord's and the fullneſs thereof*, &c. *That is* (you ſay) *you ſhall not need to ſtarve, though you do not eat of that meat*, &c. To *this* I anſwer, that our Author hath freely acknowledged, *pag.* 36. *That all things of an indifferent nature, that have formerly been abuſed to Idolatry, or Superſtition, ought to be taken away by the Governours, whenſoever they find their People inclined again ſo to abuſe them: At leaſt, if ſuch abuſe cannot probably be prevented by other means.* But our Author utterly denies, that thoſe Rites which our Church retaineth, that have been abuſed, and are ſtill, by the Church of *Rome*, have been obſerved to be any temptation to *Idolatry*, or to the embracing of *Popery*. And therefore there is (upon this ſuppoſition) no Argument to be drawn from *that* Text, againſt the Sinfulneſs of uſing thoſe Rites: becauſe the Apoſtle there forbids the *Strong* Chriſtian the eating of that meat, which a *Weak* Chriſtian ſhall inform him, was a portion of an *Idol-ſacrifice*, for *this* reaſon, *leſt he be confirmed in, or betrayed to, the ſin of Idolatry by his example, not rightly underſtood by him.* And conſequently this Chriſtian is ſuppoſed to be ſuch a *weak* one, as would be in danger of making *this* ill uſe of his Example; as being but lately converted from *Paganiſm*, and not yet ſufficiently inſtructed in the precepts of *Chriſtianity*. It is manifeſt from the immediately following verſe, that the Apoſtle forbiddeth the *eating of meat offered to Idols* upon this *ſole* account: For ſaying in the *former* verſe, *Eat not for his ſake that ſhewed it, and for Conſcience ſake*, he adds in the *latter*, that he means not that he ſhould forbear for the ſake of *his own* Conſcience, but onely for the ſake of

the *others* Conſcience. If therefore you can *prove* that theſe Rites of our Church are *Temptations* to any of its Members to go over to the *Romiſh* Church, or to commit *Idolatry* ſtill continuing therein, you ſhall be ſo far from being *oppoſed* by our Author, that he'll heartily join with you in endeavouring by all lawfull means to have them *aboliſhed*; on ſuppoſition that the Temptation cannot otherwiſe be taken away. But I deſire you, by the way, to take notice, that it is not the Deſign of his Book (which you could not but *ſee*, though you would *ſeem* not to ſee it) to plead for the *continuance* of theſe Rites (as *innocent* and *harmleſs* things at *leaſt* as he takes them to be) but onely to perſwade Diſſenters not to *ſeparate* from our Church upon the account of *ſuch* things; and to ſhew that their having *been abuſed* is no juſt ground for *Separation*. And, having minded you of *this*, I ſhall not need to tell you, that the *other* Old-Teſtament Text, which you have added to thoſe which *he* hath replied to, is alledged very impertinently: which yet we'll beſtow two or three words in anſwer to.

But firſt let us ſee what you *reply* to what he * *p.* 12. ſaith to theſe Texts. You ſay, * *you cannot poſſibly get leave of your ſelf (conſidering under what terms of Divine Abhorrence God every where mentioneth Idolatry in Holy writ, &c.) to be of the mind of our Author, that the Texts,* Lev. 19. 2. Deut. 14. 1. Lev. 19. 19. *are merely to be underſtood of things in themſelves evil.* Nor, by the way, is our *Author* of that mind, for he acknowledgeth, *pag.* 27. that the things forbidden in the *laſt* of theſe places *are things of ſo indifferent a nature, that none can be more indifferent.* But, he asks, *where it is ſaid, that theſe things were forbidden, becauſe the* Heathens *uſed them?* And he addeth, that *though* Maimonides *ſaith, that the* Egyptians *uſed theſe* Mixtures of Seeds,

and

and of Linnen and Woollen *in many of their Magical Exploits, yet 'tis univerſally acknowledged, that theſe things, among many others, were forbidden to the* Jews, *as Myſtical inſtructions in Moral duties.* But to *this* you are perfectly *ſilent.* But *why* cannot you be of our Author's mind, as to the two *other* Texts? You ſay, *The following part of the Chap.* Lev. 18. *gives ſome colour to interpret that place of things morally evil; yet, why are they forbidden under the notion of things done, after the doings of the* Egyptians *and the* Canaanites? I anſwer, becauſe they were the *doings* of thoſe people, whom they were exceedingly prone to *imitate,* even their greateſt Immoralities: And this is a ſufficient Anſwer. *Then* you tell us, Nor is *Deut.* 14. 1. or *Lev.* 19. 8. *capable of ſuch a ſenſe.* But our Author ſaith not a word of *Lev.* 19. 8. for 'tis verſe the 19*th* that he ſpeaks to, and (as hath been ſaid already) he never ſaith that in *this* place the things forbidden are *morally evil,* but the contrary. But as to thoſe things forbidden in *Deut.* 14. 1. he ſheweth that they *are morally evil,* nor is your bare ſaying, that that place is *not capable of ſuch a ſenſe,* a confutation of him.

And now we come to the Text, which you deſire your Author to conſider, in theſe words. * *But becauſe our Author tells us, he can find no other Texts*, that make more, if ſo much, for this purpoſe, *I ſhall deſire you, Sir, but to conſider* Hoſ. 2. 16, 17. *And it ſhall be at that day ſaith the Lord, that thou ſhalt call me Iſhi, and ſhalt call me no more Baali. For I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth; and they ſhall no more be remembred by their name.* Now upon this Text you ſay, *That* Baali *was a very good name; if we conſider it in its ſelf what doth it ſignifie more than* my Lord? *Adonai is of the ſame ſignification, by which name it was never unlawfull to call God:* But *becauſe the Idol was called* Baal, *God abhorred it; though he allowed himſelf to be called by another name*

* *p.* 12.

name of the ſame ſignificancy. Nor will I believe our Author himſelf owns that it was lawfull for the Jews, *to apply themſelves to God under the name of* Baali. Now becauſe you lay ſo much weight upon this Text, you ſhall have the *fuller* Anſwer. And,

1. I ſay that God doth not in the former verſe give the *Jews* a *Prohibition* no more to call him *Baali*, but makes them a gratious *Promiſe* that they ſhall not. 'Tis plain by what goes *before*, that the words are a *Promiſe*, *viz.* by the *two* foregoing verſes: wherein God promiſeth them to ceaſe from plaguing them for their Idolatry, (that is, upon their true Repentance) and to give them again happy days. And *then* he ſaith, *Thou ſhalt call me* Ilhi, *and ſhalt call me no more* Baali. That is, thou ſhalt call me no more by a name of *Fear* as אלי was, but by a name of *Love* as אישי is, *this* ſignifying *Sponſus Benignus*, but *that*, *Durus & imperioſus Maritus*, or *Dominus*, ſuch as *Baal* was to his Worſhippers; as the *Criticks* will tell you. Which is as much as to ſay, there ſhall no more be an occaſion given you from my ſevere uſage of you, to call me by a name that ſignifies, a *harſh Lord*, or he would not be to them like ſuch a Lord as *Baal* was, but he would ſhew them the kindneſs of a tenderly loving Huſband, for the time to come.

2. It is manifeſt that God's meaning was not, that they ſhould never *uſe that word* Baal, *becauſe Idolaters uſed it*, and an *Idol* was called by that name; for then they might not uſe the name *Jah* neither, becauſe the *Heathens* uſed the name Ιαω. Nor would God have called *himſelf* by the name of *Baal*, as you will find he does, *Iſa.* 54. 5. if you conſult your *Hebrew* Bible, as that word ſignifies no more than *Husband*.

3. Whereas it follows in the next verſe, *For I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth*; and *they ſhall no more be remembred by their name*. The following Criticks

ticks do give ſuch a ſenſe of them as will not in the leaſt favour your purpoſe. This is *Liveleius's*, *In the renovation of the Church, Idolatry ſhall be aboliſhed. Calvin's* is, *I will cauſe my people to caſt away all their Lies, and to be content with the pure Doctrine of my Law.* The Expoſition of *Vatablus* is *this*, *By* Baalim *God underſtands the various Images of* Baal, *which had various names according to the places wherein they were erected; as there were many* Jupiters *among the* Heathens. And whereas you ſay, *becauſe the Idol was called* Baal, *God abhorred that name*, I muſt needs tell you, that to think God can abhor a good name merely becauſe of its having been given to an Idol, ſpeaks a childiſh notion and opinion of that Infinitely perfect Being.

But after all this, let us ſuppoſe that God here forbad the *Jews* to call himſelf for the future by the name of *Baal*; this will not in the leaſt affect our Author; for if it were ſo, it could be onely upon the account of their vehement inclination to the worſhip of the *Idol Baal*; and therefore they might not take his name into their mouths, that ſo they might not be tempted, by uſing it, to worſhip him again: But our Author hath ſaid enough to convince you, that there is not the leaſt *appearance* of an Argument to be fetched from hence, againſt the lawfulneſs of our *Ceremonies*; or to prove, that ſince they were uſed without any *Idolatry* or *Superſtition* by the Ancient Fathers, before they were abuſed by the Apoſtate Church of *Rome*, they may not return to their firſt uſe, the *Idolatry* and *Superſtition* being perfectly removed: and moreover, no danger ariſing from the uſing of them, to the Members of our Church, of returning to Popery.

But in your * *next* Page, you find fault with our Author for aſſerting, as he doth in his 28*th* Page; *That there is no ſuch inclination in the Members of our Church, to go over to that of* Rome (*nor hath any ſuch incli-* * *p.* 13.

inclination been obſerved, ever ſince the Reformation) *as was in the* Jews, *to the Superſtitious and Idolatrous practices of the* Heathens. But need I ſhew you the impertinency of your *Anſwer* to this paſſage? which is *this, that the people now are more devoutly inclined, I very much doubt; I am ſure they had much more reaſon* then *than* now, *to be averſe to it; having more miraculous Operations and extraordinary appearances of God to them, than* we *can pretend to. And I am ſure the hearts of all are by* nature *now, as bad as then.* But,

1. Doth it argue that *our* people are more *devoutly* inclined, than the *Jews* were, becauſe they are not ſo inclined to *Idolatry?* Men that have nothing of Devotion in their tempers, may have no inclination at all to ſome certain Vices. But I need onely to ask you, whether the *Turks* be a *devouter* ſort of people than the *Jews* then were, or whether the *Jews* be more devout *now*, than they were *then?* becauſe (as every body knows) they *both* have at preſent not onely no *inclination*, but the greateſt *abhorrence* to Idolatry, and ſo have had for many ages.

2. What if the *Jews* had *more miraculous Operations among them*, &c. doth it thence follow, that *we* muſt therefore be neceſſarily as much inclined to Idolatry, as *they* were? why then are not the *Turks* as much inclined, or the preſent *Jews*, who have no more *Miraculous Operations* among *them*, than *we* have among *us?*

3. What though our hearts be *as bad by nature*, as the hearts of the Ancient *Jews* were, muſt *we* needs be therefore as much inclined to *Idolatry* as *they* were? Why then, I ask again, are not the hearts of the *Turks* and *Modern Jews* as much inclined thereunto? And yet I fear the hearts of each of theſe are no better by nature, than *theirs* were. But I am almoſt aſhamed to make any reply to ſuch talk as *this.* And how, Sir, is it, that you can perſwade your ſelf *thus* to object, againſt ſo plain a matter

matter of fact, as no one can be *plainer*, or more indiſputable?

But in what *follows*, you *ſuppoſe* that we *have a greater antipathy to Popery* now, than we had formerly, though you do not *grant* it; and then add, that *if ſo*, you fear the *Iriſh Rebellion*, and the *Fire of* London *and other places*, *have more contributed to it*, *than peoples natural inclinations to true Worſhip*, *or averſion from Idolatry*. Well, let the cauſe thereof be what it will, if we *have* a greater Antipathy, that's as much as our *Author* aſſerted: He did not aſſign the *Cauſe* of it.

But, I pray, did you obſerve any *greater* inclination to Popery *before* the Fire of *London*, than you *now* obſerve? Or *before* the *Iriſh Rebellion* either, if you are ſo old as to be able ſo *early* to make Obſervations? I may ask too, what hath made the ſo often mentioned *Turks* or Modern *Jews* to be ſo exceedingly averſe to Idolatry, that the *Iriſh* Rebellion, and Fire of *London* muſt needs make *us* ſo, and nothing elſe?

By *this* time, I hope you need not to be told the *reaſon*, which you ſay *you underſtand not*, *why there is not a neceſſity*, *for the keeping as wide a diſtance between* Proteſtants *and* Papiſts, *as God appointed ſhould be kept between the* Jews, *and the* Egyptians. Though I will lay you a wager, you cannot prove that there *is not* as great a diſtance in *Rites* and *Ceremonies* between *our* Church and the Church of *Rome*, as there was by Divine Appointment between the *Jews* and the *Egyptians*. And I'll lay you *another*, that there is a *greater* than was by Divine Approbation between the *Jews* and divers of the *Heathen* Nations.

The *next* Page, *viz.* the 14*th*, containeth nothing but what hath been already fully anſwered; or what is ſo *trifling* as not to deſerve the leaſt conſideration.

In your 15*th* Page, you ſay that *our Author cannot but*

know that Calvin, P. Martyr, *and* Zanchy, *and others of our Famous firſt Reformers, have ſaid much more againſt the retaining unneceſſary things abuſed to Idolatry, than* he *can bring to teſtifie any of their Approbation of them.* But, in the mean time, I perceive you are very willing to have it thought, that Mr. *Calvin* made *no bones* of contradicting himſelf; though we beg your pardon for not believing it, till you are pleaſed to *cite* thoſe paſſages wherein he doth ſo. Methinks you might have favoured us with *one* at leaſt, in oppoſition to thoſe *many* our Author hath cited. But why ſhould you be ſo altogether ſilent too, in the quoting of your *other* Authors? But if you had been never ſo *copious* herein, except you could have brought them in pleading for the Lawfulneſs of *Separation* upon the account of the *Rites* retained in our Church, which are abuſed by the Papiſts, you cannot but be aware that all your Quotations had been *nothing* to the purpoſe of confuting our Author. But you are ſo far from being able to doe *this*, that you cannot find them ſo much as pleading againſt the Lawfulneſs of *Miniſterial* Conformity. But, on the other hand, I preſume you need not be told, that divers of them have declared their Judgments for it: Nor that *Zanchy* particularly, at the ſame time endeavoured to perſwade Queen *Elizabeth* to moderate the urging of Ceremonies, and to perſwade the *Miniſters* not to ſtand it out againſt her Majeſty's pleaſure, if ſhe could not be prevailed with. And this he ſaith he did by the advice of his *Prince*, and many *Miniſters*.

You proceed to tell us, That our Famous Reformers *by the Spirit of Prophecy have lamented the probable future ſtate* (you ſhould have ſaid the *certain* future ſtate, if they were acted by the Spirit of Prophecy) *of thoſe Churches, that have retained any* Neſt Eggs *belonging to thoſe Old Birds. What Religion is come to the* Saxon, *and divers other Lutheran Churches, we need not tell our Author;*

what

what is coming among us, time will ſhew. But no conſiderative man needs to be told, Sir, that if we ſhould be ſo miſerable as to have Popery again prevail in this Kingdom, we are not to thank our *Liturgy*, or our *Rites* and *Ceremonies* for it, as the true cauſe thereof, but our as *Unreaſonable* as *Unchriſtian Diviſions*, and our being crumbled into ſo many Sects and Parties, which have extremely weakened our Church; which, were ſhe *as a City united within her ſelf*, would ſtill be, no doubt, as impregnable a Bulwark againſt the Aſſaults of the *Romaniſts* as ſhe hath (God be thanked) hitherto been. And for this reaſon alone, though theſe Diviſions tended to no *other* Miſchief (as ſeveral other great and lamentable ones are produced by them) I would not for all the world fall under the guilt of having contributed to them, by inſtilling ſuch prejudices into the minds of people as might cauſe them to withdraw from the Communion of our Church, and embody themſelves in ſeparate Congregations.

Page 15. You *next* reply to what our Author ſaith in reference to *Hezekiah's breaking in pieces the Brazen Serpent*, in his 35*th* Page. And whereas he ſaith,

1. That *it was not onely a thing* defiled *in Idolatrous Services, but was made an* Idol *it ſelf.* You reply, *but no more than the* Croſs, *or the* Picture *of the* Virgin Mary, *is at this day made by the* Papiſts. I anſwer, do you ſhew, if you can, what *Papiſts* have made an *Idol* of an *Aerial* Sign of the *Croſs.* And as to the *Picture* of the *Virgin Mary*, is *that* one of *our* Ceremonies?

2. Our Author ſaith that the *Brazen Serpent* was at *that* time *actually* uſed as an *Idol.* You reply, So is the *Croſs* by the *Papiſts.* But is this an Anſwer? You know the onely *pertinent* Anſwer would have been, that it is made uſe of as an *Idol* by Church of *England-men*, as the Brazen Serpent was by *Jews.* But this is ſo far from being *true*, that there is no *Croſs* uſed among *us*, that

was ever made an *Idol*, or Object of Worſhip, by the *Papiſts*.

3. Our Author ſaith, *That the* Jews *were* generally *lapſed into this Idolatry.* You reply, *ſo are the* Papiſts *univerſally.* But if you would ſpeak to the purpoſe, you ſhould have ſaid, and proved, that ſo are Church of *England-men*, either *univerſally* or *generally.*

4. Our Author ſaith, that *there was little hope of reclaiming the* Jews *any other way.* You ſay, *there is as little hope of reclaiming the* Papiſts *from their Idolatry of the* Croſs. But I will not a *third* time repeat the ſame Anſwer. Onely I will ask whether there be any hope of reclaiming the *Papiſts* from their Idolatry by *our* laying aſide our Ceremonies?

5. Our Author ſaith, that *although the* Brazen Serpent *had been a thing onely defiled in Idolatrous Services, yet we freely grant, that it ought to have been deſtroyed, or removed out of the peoples ſight, if the continuance of it in their view were like to be a ſnare to them, and a temptation to Idolatry.* You reply, *may not the like be ſaid of what* Diſſenters *plead againſt?* But you have been already told, that the like may *not* be ſaid, with any colour or ſhew of reaſon.

6. Our Author ſaith. *That if* Hezekiah *had let it ſtand, private perſons might have made uſe of it, to put them in mind of the wonderfull mercy of God, expreſſed by it to their Fore-fathers.* This you acknowledge, but ſay, that *the Queſtion at preſent under our debate is, whether* Hezekiah *might lawfully have let it ſtand, and removed it into the Temple? whether his ſetting it up by the* Ark, *or* Mercy Seat *would have purged it?* But for *ſhame*, Sir, do not ſay that this is the Queſtion in debate between us.

In your 16*th* Page, you expreſs very great offence, at thoſe next words of our Author, *pag.* 36. *And much more might they have lawfully continued in the Communion of the Church,*

Church, ſo long as there was no conſtraint laid upon them, to join with them in their Idolatry. But you *leave out* what *follows*, viz. *as we do not reade of any that ſeparated from the Church, while the* Brazen Serpent *was permitted to ſtand, as wofully abuſed, as it was, by the Generality.* And do you find that the pious *Jews* did ſeparate upon this account? Or if they did not, will you ſay that they were guilty of *Sin*? For *my* part, I dare not ſay ſo; nor that it would be a ſin *now*, not to ſeparate from our Church, though our Governours were ſo remiſs as not to Excommunicate *Idolaters*, if ſuch were found therein; any more than it is ſo, upon the account of *Promiſcuous Congregations*, and *Mixt Communions:* As the Worthy perſon that publiſhed the Reſolution of *that* caſe, hath clearly proved, and proved too that it is *Unlawfull* to ſeparate upon that pretence. But you ſay, *you can never believe this, till ſome can prove to you, that a* Wife *may lawfully, contrary to the command of her* Husband, *ſtay in a Family of* Whoremongers, *provided that ſhe be not compelled to play the Whore.* I anſwer, that a Wife may not lawfully, though her Husband hath not *expreſly* forbidden it, ſtay in a Family conſiſting *wholly* of Whoremongers, except to bear her Husband company, and in *that* caſe it is her *duty* to ſtay. But where hath Chriſt forbidden us to Communicate with a Church out of which Idolaters are not ejected, though Idolatry be not enjoined. You ſay he hath done it in thoſe words, *Rev.* 18.4.---*Come out of her my people*, but I pray read on, and you have an anſwer, *that ye be not partaker of her ſins, and that ye receive not* (*viz.* by partaking of her ſins) *of her plagues*? And moreover, I preſume you will acknowledge, that the *Babylon* which the Chriſtians were commanded to *come out of*, is the Idolatrous Church of *Rome:* But I need not acquaint you, that you cannot continue in *this* Church, except you will *your ſelf* alſo be an *Idolater.*

But

But I will not ſtand to diſpute *this* point with you, it being nothing to the buſineſs of our Author's Book; and all he aſſerts as to *this* matter, doth amount to no more than *this*, That we are not obliged to renounce Communion in *pure* Ordinances, with ſuch as we know to be guilty of *Idolatry*, when it lies not in our power to keep them away.

And now you have brought me to our Author's *Third* Head of Diſcourſe, *viz.* That *the Agreement which is between the Church of* England, *and the Church of* Rome, *is in no wiſe ſuch, as will make Communion with the Church of* England *unlawfull.*

You ſay, Page 17*th*, That *if our Author had ſaid* all *Communion*, (*viz.* with the Church of *England*) *is not unlawfull, you had fully concurred with him; believing that this Church cannot be juſtly charged with Idolatry, and that ſome Communion may, and ought to be held with any Church that is not ſo charged.* If you mean by *ſome Communion*, a not *being divided in heart*, as you before expreſs it, I ſay again, we thank you for nothing; the Communion which our Author pleads for, being (as your ſelf obſerves in your firſt Page.) *chiefly Communion in* Worſhip. But you proceed, ſaying, *but as he hath laid it, I cannot agree with it. I am ſure Chriſt had Communion with the* Jewiſh *Church, and I believe he had ſo, in all acts of worſhip of his Father's Inſtitution, and I am as ſure he had no Communion with them in the Traditional part of their worſhip, as I am, that he would not himſelf practiſe, what he condemned ſo ſeverely.* But are you not as ſure that our Bleſſed Lord had Communion with the *Jewiſh* Church, in all acts of worſhip *inſtituted by his Father*, as you are that he had *no* Communion with them in the *Traditional* part of their Worſhip? I am *ſure*, that in the *former* part of that ſaying you are too too cautious, and in the latter not ſo cautious as you ought to have been: For you may be

ſure

ſure of the *contrary* to what you affirm ſo poſitively, when you have conſidered, that our Lord could not have ſo freely been *admitted into the Temple*, had he not obſerved divers Traditions or Canons of the *Elders*, without complying with which none might come thither. I ſhall not ſtand to inſtance in particulars, but refer you to Dr. *Leightfoot's Temple Service*, pag. 115. to 120. And again, you may yet be *more* ſure of the contrary, when you have conſidered, how our Lord complied with *Jewiſh Traditions*, in the *celebration of the Paſſover*; and *ſuch* too as altered certain circumſtances preſcribed in its *Firſt Inſtitution*. Particularly, his ordering the Preparation of the Lamb on the 14*th* day, when *Moſes* ordained the taking of it up upon the 10*th* day. His eating the Paſſover *lying along*, being the poſture in which they ate their ordinary Meals, according to a Jewiſh Tradition, as you may ſee in Dr. *Leightfoot's* foreſaid Book, *pag.* 143, 144. whereas, according to *Moſes* his Inſtitution, *it was to be eaten with their Loins girded*, &c. *and in haſte*, or ſtanding. His complying with the Jewiſh cuſtoms of *drinking Wine* at the *Paſſover*, and concluding with the *Hallel*, or a Hymn. And not *theſe* onely but *more* Traditions than theſe, Dr. *Leightfoot* will ſatisfie you, were conformed to by our Bleſſed Saviour.

But you ſay Chriſt *condemned ſeverely* the *Jewiſh Traditions:* But I ſay, he did not *at all* condemn *all* Jewiſh Traditions, and none but ſuch as by which *they made the Commandments of God of none effect:* And ſuch as they placed *ſpecial Holineſs* in, and neceſſary to acceptance with God; as is too evident to need my ſtanding to prove it. And, Sir, when you can prove that *our Ceremonies* are like to thoſe condemned Traditions, I will undertake that our Author ſhall be as zealous againſt complying with them, as he is now againſt ſeparation from our Church upon the account of them.

But

But to go on, whereas our Author saith, of *Episcopal Government* and the three other following things, *pag.* 38. *That he takes it for granted that there is nothing of Viciousneß or Immorality in any of them, to make them Unlawfull*; and therefore that they are indifferent in *their own nature.* You reply, *pag.* 18. That *there are few things to be named unlawfull in this sense.* I answer, there are as many things unlawfull in this sense, as there are things prohibited by the *Moral* Law, and if you please to consult our Expositors of the Decalogue, I presume you'll find those things not a *few.*

You say at the bottom of this 18*th* Page, *That it troubles you to reade your Author saying*, I know not how our Brethren will defend the Apostolical Institution of the Observation of the Lord's day, while they contend that *this* of *Episcopacy* cannot be concluded from the uninterrupted Tradition of the Catholique Church, *&c.* And *why*, I pray, Sir, doth this trouble you? You give this reason why, *viz. Because certainly, for the Apostolical practice in the Observation of the Lord's day, we have the infallible evidence of Holy Scripture*, Acts 20. 1 Cor. 16. But you must prove that we have in those Scriptures, or some *other*, infallible evidence for the Apostolical *Institution* of the Observation of the Lord's day, and not for the mere Apostolical *practice*, or you will say nothing to the purpose. But to save my self the labour of saying more upon this Argument, and of replying to those few lines that follow against the Primitiveness of *our* Episcopacy, I entreat you to consult Mr. *Chillingworth's Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy demonstrated*, together with the most Learned Dean of St *Pauls* his Ample Proof of *these two Propositions*, in his *Unreasonableneß of Separation*, p. 244, *&c.* viz. First, *that our Diocesan Episcopacy is the same for substance which was in the Primitive Church.* And Secondly, *That it is not repugnant to any Institution of Christ, nor devising*

deviſing a new ſpecies of Churches without God's Authority.

As to what you ſay, *p.* 19. about *Liturgies, viz.* that *they cannot be indifferent, if indeed* (as our Author ſpeaks) *they be highly* expedient *to be univerſally impoſed, yea neceſſary.* I reply, you have not caught him in a Contradiction, as you think; for his ſaying concerning *Liturgies*, &c. *pag.* 38. is, *That he takes it for granted, that they are all indifferent in their own nature.* And tells you what he means by *thoſe words*, in the *next*; viz. *that there is nothing of viciouſneſs or immorality in any of them*, &c. Now is it a contradiction to ſay of the ſame thing, that it is *indifferent in its own nature*, and that 'tis *neceſſary conſidering certain circumſtances?* And I farther ſay, that Liturgies are *neceſſary*, conſidering, that through humane Weakneſs and Frailty, the performance of publick worſhip with that Solemnity and Gravity, which it calls for, cannot be ſecured; and yet notwithſtanding they are ſtill things in *their own nature* indifferent; and ſo are all thoſe things too which God's *Poſitive* Laws have made neceſſary; as all know who underſtand the difference between *Moral* and *Poſitive.*

But as to the Antiquity of Liturgies, which you ſay our *Author knoweth to be denied*, you have had a good while extant that Diſcourſe which he ſaid was expected, and which you ſay *you will patiently wait for*, to give you ſatisfaction, about this matter. And it is excellently fitted (as I hope you have before now found) not onely for the ſatisfying of Diſſenters about *that* point relating to Liturgies, but *divers others* alſo.

In your next Paragraph, you tell us, *that all Divines will readily acknowledge, that ſuch a Method and Order of a Liturgy, as is not contrived in Subſerviency to the* 3 *General Rules, of Doing all to* Edification, *the* Glory of God, *and* not giving offence to any of the Churches of God, *may make it unlawfull.* And I alſo do readily acknowledge *this*, and am confi-

dent that you cannot prove, that *Ours* is not ſo contrived as to be made not Subſervient unto thoſe Rules. And as to the *laſt* of them, whatſoever Churches pleaſe to *take* offence at our Liturgy, I am ſure it *gives* no offence to them.

In what follows you profeſs, *that you never thought it unlawfull for any* Laick, *wholly to ſeparate from the Church of* England, *becauſe of our Liturgy* (and I hope you think it no more *Lawfull* for a Clergy-man) *nor did your ſelf ever ſo ſeparate.* But for all that, you know that many *hundreds* and I fear ſome *thouſands* do. But you ſay, *there is a new Generation ſtarted up, that not onely makes* you *a Separatiſt, but all* Conformable *Miniſters, if they do not every time read the Second Service at the Altar.* This in good earneſt, is ſomewhat a hard Caſe; but I pray Sir, by what figure do you call one *Start-up Warm Head a new Generation?*

In your next Paragraph, *pag.* 20. You ſay, *Our Author hath ſpied four little Thorns in ſome Diſſenters Fleſh, which he hath very charitably endeavoured to pick out.* And you add, that *you will candidly enquire if no bit of them remain which may cauſe pain, and hinder healing.* To make no reflexion, Sir, upon your expreſſing your ſelf thus phancifully, your meaning muſt be, that you will enquire whether our Author hath not well defended the *four* things in our Liturgy, which Diſſenters object againſt as ſymbolizings with the Roman Service, from being liable to juſt Offence: Of which,

The Firſt is, *The ſhortneſs of many Prayers.* But you ſay not one word in anſwer to what he ſpeaks in the Vindication thereof: But tell us, that *if ſome Diſſenters think that throughout the Scriptures there is nothing like* this *to be found, either in the Prayers of* Solomon, *&c. or any others, and be a little ſtumbled at it, you cannot condemn them:* But you muſt needs condemn it as an errour in them, to think there are no ſhort Prayers to be found in the Holy Scriptures, when there are many more *ſhort*, than there

there are *long* Prayers: When our Saviour uſed in the Garden *thrice*, a ſhorter Prayer than is any one in *our* Service: And when the Form he left behind him for *our uſe* is a *very* ſhort one. But if the uſing of a *ſhort Prayer* be not the thing blamed, but the uſing of *ſeveral* ſuch in the ſame Service, inſtead of one very long one, I muſt take leave to ſay, *this* is mere Wantonneſs. And whereas you ſay, *you cannot condemn Diſſenters, if they be a little ſtumbled at it*; I ſay, to be ſtumbled at it ſo, as to make it one pretence for not joining with us in our Prayers, is not to be a *little* ſtumbled at it. And you know that *that* which our Author is concerned to doe is, to perſwade Diſſenters not to be ſo much ſtumbled at any thing in our Prayers, as to *leave our Communion* upon the account thereof. Though he would be very glad to have them ſo well pleaſed with all of them, as not to be in the *leaſt* ſtumbled at any of them.

The *Second* inſtance is, *The Peoples bearing a part with the Miniſter in Divine Service.* And whereas our Author hath thought it enough to tranſcribe what Mr. *Baxter* hath ſaid in five particulars, to vindicate both the Lawfulneſs and Fitneſs hereof; you reply not one word to any of them. But you think you have *balanced* (as your word is) thoſe five with five of your own. 1. You ſay, *Theſe Reſponſes do not ſuit the gravity and ſolemnity of* Divine Worſhip. But we ſay they do; and our *yea* is as good as your *nay*. 2. You ſay, *many read falſe oftentimes.* And whoſe fault is it, if they do? But it appears from what is coming, that you cannot prove it. 3. You ſay, *Many Children and Girls, underſtand not what they doe.* And therefore why do you permit them to join in *Singing?* And why do you ſuffer them to hear Sermons? 4. *Thoſe that cannot read*, you ſay, *are not edified in a confuſed noiſe, not being able to underſtand what is read.* And then I hope you might have ſpared your

ſecond particular; for thoſe that read *falſely* cannot then be obſerved ſo to doe in this confuſed noiſe. 5. You ſay, *Many leud and profane perſons, are thus made to bear their ſhare in the Miniſterial part of Publique Worſhip*, &c. But do you prove that this is bearing a ſhare in that part of Publique Worſhip which is *proper* and *peculiar* to the *Miniſter*; and *then* we will grant that not onely no *profane* men, but no *Lay-men* neither, be they never ſo *good*, may have their part therein. 6. You ſay, *There is no ſuch practice in the Churches of God, in* New England, Scotland, France, Holland, &c. Do you think that our Author hath taken the *Solemn League and Covenant*, that you urge ſuch an Argument as *this* to *him*? If you do, you are much miſtaken, Sir. But Mr. *Baxter* tells you, in his fifth particular, *That it was the decay of zeal in the people that firſt ſhut out the Reſponſes*: And therefore thoſe Churches you mention ſhould doe well to imitate *ours* in this particular. I am conſtrained, Sir, to tell you again, that I am aſhamed of taking any notice of ſuch talk as *this*.

The *Third* inſtance is, *The taking of ſome of the Collects out of the* Miſſal. You ſay *you wiſh our Author had told us how many*. But I ſay, 'tis not worth the knowing (if it were I could ſoon tell you) if thoſe that are taken thence are all *good* ones. And (conſidering what hath been ſaid) this is a ſufficient Anſwer. Remember our Author hath told you, that our Departure from the Church of *Rome*, was deſigned to be a *Reformation*, not a total *Deſtruction* and *Extirpation*. And I ſuppoſe the zeal of ſome Reformers that hurried them upon making no diſcrimination between things *faulty*, and thoſe that were *innocent*, occaſioned that honeſt ſaying of *Zanchy*'s, which I have heretofore *ſomewhere* met with, *viz. Non intelligo iſtam Reformatorum Mundi Theologiam.*

As

As to that which follows to the laſt Paragraph of *pag.* 23*d*. Enough abundantly hath already been ſaid to ſatisfie you that you might have ſpared it. Onely let me once for all tell you, that whereas both *here* and *elſewhere*, you inſiſt upon our being at perfect liberty as to the uſing or not uſing thoſe unneceſſary things, wherein we ſymbolize with the Church of *Rome*; you ought to know that while they are *Enjoyned*, we who are under Government are *not* at liberty; as the Chriſtians in the Apoſtles days were, as to the *Eating of Meats*, &c. And whereas you touch here upon the topick of *Scandal*, I can not hope to ſatisfie you about this Point; if the two late judicious Reſolutions of *that* Caſe cannot do it: To which I refer you, and ought ſo to doe, it not falling within our Author's Undertaking.

The *Fourth* inſtance is, *The Appointing of Leſſons out of the Apocryphal Books*. And what you ſay under this head, amounts to thus much, that *you think it were better* if they were not appointed. And therefore I perceive you are not for making this a Pretence for *Separation*, and Conſequently you can have no controverſie with our Author about it. Whether it were better or not, that we ſhould imitate the *Primitive Church* in reading them now and then on *Holy-days* and ordinary *Week-days*, merely for *Example of life, and inſtruction of Manners, but not for the Eſtabliſhing of any Doctrine*, let it be left to our Superiors to judge. But though you have a greater latitude than many other Diſſenters, as to this matter, yet you ſay that *all ſhould not be forced out of their wits, nor made to doe what, they cannot, as well as you, apprehend lawfull*. No, God forbid, that any one ſhould be forced out of his wits upon ſuch an account. But whom can you name that hath had the leaſt trouble given him, for not being at Church on a Week-day *Holy-day*?

But I muſt take notice of one more paſſage, before I proceed,

proceed, *viz.* Holy-days *are the ſame with* Sabbath-days, *with thoſe who judge that there is nothing but* Tradition *for either.* Here is a good *Wipe* for our Author. But I pray, Sir, did he ſay that *there is nothing but Tradition for the Obſervation of the Sabbath*? He ſaid *that* indeed, *pag.* 40th, from whence it may be inferred, that he believes that the *Apoſtolical* inſtitution of the Obſervation of the *Lord's day*, is wholly to be gathered from the uninterrupted Tradition or Practice of the Catholick Church; and is *that* ſuch a *ſmall matter* to found it upon? When 'tis the foundation on which is built the Canon of the Holy Scriptures. But who are they that tell you, that from the Uninterrupted Tradition of the Catholick Church may be gathered the Apoſtolical inſtitution of the *Other Holy-days*? Name any one if you are able that ſo ſaith, or that ſaith that they are of *Apoſtolical inſtitution.*

Now we are come to thoſe particular *Rites and Ceremonies* of our Church, in which our Author ſaith, *pag.* 45. *Our ſymbolizing with Popery is ſo much condemned.* And you ſay, *pag.* 24*th.* that he obſerveth in the general,

1. *That our Ceremonies are not the hundredth part* (you ſhould have added *ſcarcely*) *of thoſe uſed by the Papiſts.* And this you *grant*; but you add, *that we may as well* Symbolize in *thirty* as in *three.* But I muſt make bold to tell you, you never uttered a more inconſiderative ſaying. It ſeems then, 'tis no matter how *many* Ceremonies are uſed in Divine Worſhip, ſo they be all innocent. I am ſure St. *Auguſtin* was not of this mind. But it may be you'll ſay there are *none* innocent. But if ſo, you cannot ſay that we may as well uſe *thirty* as *three*: Becauſe the *thirty* muſt neceſſarily be a great hindrance to that attention of mind that Divine Worſhip calls for; but he muſt have a Weak head *indeed*, whoſe mind muſt needs be diverted by *three.*

2. Our Author ſaith, that *our Church impoſeth them not*

not, as the other doth, on the Conſciences of her Members, as things of Neceſſity, as parts of Religion or meritorious Services. And you need not one word more of Anſwer to what you object againſt this than you have had already given you, *viz. pag.* 6.

In your 25*th.* page, you begin, as our Author does, with the Ceremony of the *Surplice*; and

1. You ſay, *he rightly obſerveth that all are not obliged to wear it.* And this is ſagaciouſly indeed obſerved by him, if he does obſerve it; but he onely ſaith, that *he cannot imagine why thoſe who are not obliged to wear it, ſhould be affrighted from our Churches, by the mere ſight of ſo innocent a thing*, as he before had proved it to be, as it is uſed in *our* Church; but ſhewed it is far from being an innocent thing, as it is uſed in the Church of *Rome.*

2. You ſay, that *you are not ſcandaliz'd at the ſight of it.* But for all that, you know that not a few Diſſenters do profeſs to be ſo.

3. You ſay, that *you are not ſure, that they uſe a Garment of the ſame form in the Church of* Rome; *though they uſe ſome Garment of the ſame* Colour; *ſo that you doubt, whether in that we do ſymbolize with the Church of* Rome *or no.* I was in good hope when I had read *thus far*, that there would have been no Controverſie between you and our Author about this Ceremony. But I preſently found my ſelf miſtaken; for

4. You make us notwithſtanding faultily to ſymbolize with the Church of *Rome, in that we will not ſuffer this Garment to be worn but in Acts of Worſhip. So that*, you ſay, *it is neither merely for* neceſſity, *nor* natural decency, *nor* Ornament, *nor for* diſtinction. But I ſay that this Garment is required, both for *Ornament* and *Diſtinction.* You ſay it is not required for *either*, becauſe *all Miniſters wear it not at other times.* But I deny your Conſequence; for it is required as an Ornamental Garment *in Divine Worſhip*, and

and for distinction between a Minister *officiating* and *not officiating*. You may as well say that for the same reason, the *Judges* Scarlet is neither for *Ornament* nor *Distinction*. And seeing it is such an Offence that this Garment should be appropriated to Divine Worship, I desire you, Sir, at your Leisure to answer our Famous *Hooker*'s Question, *viz. To solemn Actions of Royalty and Justice, their suitable Ornaments are a Beauty; are they onely in Religion a Stain?* Time was when putting on a *Gown* merely for the *Desk* and *Pulpit* was accounted no Offence by Non-Conforming Ministers, and consequently they did not then espy any Unlawfulness, in appropriating a Garment to Religious exercises. Nor do we place one jot more holiness in a *Surplice* than in a *Gown*, or *Cloak* either. But you say, *may not jealousies of some homage by it intended to God, and such thoughts*, as those you suggested, *arise in weaker Christians?* I answer, whether these thoughts *may* arise in them or no, you take as effectual a course as you can that they *should* arise in them. And as for *Homage intended to God* by wearing the Surplice, I don't think any Christians so weak as to phansie such a thing, if you and others would but *let them alone*, and not fill their heads with objections against innocent things, when you might employ your time with them to infinitely better purpose. I pray, Sir, be not offended if I once for all freely tell you, that by your possessing these weak Christians with all imaginable objections against the Lawfulness of obeying Governours in things which are made by your selves doubtfull to them, and not with *one* Objection against the Unlawfulness of Disobedience in doubtfull matters; is the way to make them *everlastingly* weak, and to make them *worse* than weak too. It saddens the hearts of not a few good people to observe, that the fearfull consequents of such doings have not yet made you sensible *whose* interest

Eccl. pol. Book 5th. p. 228. Last Edit.

intereſt you have all along ſerved, by the means of them.

You next object three things againſt the Ceremony of the *Croſs* in *Baptiſm*, *pag.* 26.

1. You ſay, *it is an adding to the Divine Inſtitution* unneceſſarily. I anſwer we add *nothing* to Divine Inſtitution. I mean we add nothing more to Baptiſm, or any other Ordinance, as of Divine Inſtitution, than *your ſelves* do. And as to the *Unneceſſarineſs* of this Ceremony: if it were *neceſſary* it would be no *Ceremony*, at leaſt no *humane* one. If you mean there is no neceſſity of impoſing it. It is enough for a Ceremony that it is impoſed *for good and profitable ends and uſes:* And our Church tells you for *what* ends and uſes *this* of the *Croſs* is required, in the 30*th* Canon. If you mean there is no neceſſity of *uſing* it, now it is *impoſed:* I beg your pardon for being of a contrary opinion, till you prove it to be a Tranſgreſſion of any law of God: And when you have done *this*, I will grant that it is neceſſary *not* to uſe it.

2. You ſay, *we attribute to the ſign of the Croſs, more than is truly due to it, as the* Papiſts *do.* But *we* ſay, we *do not*, and ſhall perſiſt in ſaying ſo, till you prove we *do.*

3. You ſay, that to expound *Dedicated* in the *Canon* by *Declared* (you ſhould have ſaid *declared to be dedicated*) *is a Catachreſtical uſe of the word.* What care I for that, if the word *ought* ſo to be expounded. You ſay, *you will take no private Doctor's word for it, though greater than Dr.* Burges. But you cannot otherwiſe underſtand that word, except you will make our Church to ſpeak contradictions in that *Canon.*

There is nothing you object, or I think can object, againſt the Ceremony of *Kneeling* at the *Communion*, but you may find moſt ſatisfactorily anſwered in the Learned *Reſolution of the Caſe of* Kneeling, *&c.* But yet we will not wholly paſs by what you ſay againſt it. Having called the *Declaration of our Church* concerning it, an *ex-*

cellent Declaration, *pag. 26th*, you ſay, *pag. 27th, that it may be it ſatisfieth you, abſtracting your thoughts from the Bread, while you are upon your Knees:* And he that cannot, with the greateſt eaſe in the world, abſtract his thoughts from the Bread, muſt be almoſt ſtarved with faſting. *But*, it follows, *if all cannot be ſo ſatisfied, ſhall they therefore be Ruined for their doubt in this thing?* You ſhall have no *new* anſwer to this, beſides asking you *this Queſtion*, if there be any danger of Ruine in this caſe, who are *moſt charitable* to theſe Doubters, thoſe that doe their utmoſt to ſatisfie them, that they may not come near the danger, or thoſe that uſe their utmoſt endeavours to make all means unſucceſsfull, that are uſed for their Satisfaction?

I muſt needs take notice alſo of your pleaſant anſwer to *this* paſſage in our Author, *pag.* 49. *viz.* That *there being nothing ſaid of the Geſture in our Saviour's Inſtitution of this Sacrament, he hath conſequently left the* particular *Geſture to the Determination of the Church; a Geſture being in the* general *neceſſary.* Your anſwer is, *Our Saviour bad his Diſciples* Baptize, *but ſaith nothing of* Water, *nor from what* Fountain or River; *hath he therefore left it to the* Churches determination; *that Miniſters ſhall Baptize onely with* Roſe-water, *or Water fetched from the* River? Truly, Sir, a *ſmile* is the beſt Reply that is due to *this.* But do you in ſober ſadneſs then think, that nothing is left by Chriſt to the Churches Determination, neither *place*, nor *time*, nor any *other* Circumſtance? If this be not wild Fanaticiſm, there is no ſuch thing in nature; and I know you'll acknowledge it. But if the Church may determine the *place* of publick worſhip, and the *times of day* when to meet, becauſe our Lord hath not determined ſuch particulars; why may not the Church determine particular *Geſtures*, when they are not by him determined? And can you think, Sir, that it is well done

after

after this manner to *Ridicule* the Churche's Power? No, I know you cannot think ſo, and therefore this was an haſty Slip from your Pen, which you will not upon Second thoughts juſtifie.

You ſay at the Bottom of this page, That *you do not think what our Author mentions, pag.* 50. *of the* Ring in Marriage *worth the ſpeaking to: Becauſe Diſſenters generally believe the* Ring *a* Civil *Pledg*, &c. I wiſh they *univerſally* thought ſo, and if they do not (as time was when you know they did not) I know not why you ſhould add, that *How it comes into our debate you cannot tell.*

Next you ſpend the beſt part of two pages upon our *Holy-days*, which is our Author's *laſt* inſtance of *Rites* which Diſſenters are offended with, upon the account of our Symbolizing in them with the Church of *Rome*. And

1. You ſay, *That it is God's Prerogative alone to make a day* Holy, i. e. *ſuch as it ſhall be ſinfull for any to labour in.* But do you think that God's *Vicegerents* have not power given them to ſet apart days to a holy *uſe*? And in any *other* ſenſe *we* do not think that any day is capable of being made *Holy*. 'Tis manifeſt from what *follows*, that you do not think ſo. And if you do not, can you think that our Governours have no power to forbid ordinary Labour upon thoſe days, which they have ſo ſet apart? And if they have *this power*, can you think it *lawfull* to *diſobey* thoſe laws of theirs, that prohibit working on thoſe days? And, if this *be not* lawfull, then I fear 'tis *Sinfull*.

2. You ſay, *That God's Revelation of his Will for ſolemn Praiſes upon the Receipt of Signal Mercies; or ſolemn Prayers in times of great Diſtreſs, juſtifieth* Magiſtrates, or Churches *in ſetting apart in ſuch Caſes, Days for Praiſe and Prayers.* Then, I hope, the *Magiſtrates* or the *Church*, have power to make a day *Holy*; and Conſequently, they

may forbid *opening of Shops*, and *Ordinary labour*, on ſuch a day: And therefore 'tis ſinfull to diſobey them herein.

3. You ſay, *That all ſuch days ought to be intirely ſpent in Religious Exerciſes.* But notwithſtanding you are ſo *dogmatical*, in this thing, I am Confident upon ſecond thoughts you'll acknowledge you were too raſh: For you cannot really *think* what you aſſert with ſuch Confidence, except you can find in your heart to reprove *Ringing of Bells*, and *innocent Recreations* after Sermon, on the *Fifth of November*, as Profanations of that *Holy-day*. And I hope we may make bold to call *that* day a *Holy-day*; it being ſo according to your own Conceſſion in the *foregoing* particular.

4. You ſay, *That to ſpend an hour of ſuch a Day in Prayer, and all the reſt in Idleneſs, Drinking, Revelling, Gaming*, &c. *is not to keep a* Holy *but a* Licentious *Day.* No body *doubts* this: But are you obliged by our Church *ſo* to ſpend Her Holy-days? And if you are not, but may keep them as ſtrictly as you pleaſe, what a ſtrange objection is this againſt the lawfulneſs of obſerving them!

5. You ſay, *That there is no need of keeping any ſuch days, in Commemoration of the* Birth, Death, Reſurrection *or* Aſcenſion *of Chriſt; becauſe God hath appointed* fifty two, *every year for that purpoſe.* I anſwer, if you mean by *no need*, that there is no *abſolute neceſſity* of the Churches ſetting apart days for the Commemoration of Chriſt's *Birth, Death*, &c. we will perhaps grant it; but what then? Doth it thence follow that the well obſerving ſuch days doth not tend to our Edification, to the more *building us up in our holy Faith*, and encreaſe in Holineſs? you dare not *ſay* or *think* ſo. But I ſay farther, that the well obſerving them is of *admirable* uſe. And nothing would tend more to our Growth in all the Chriſtian Vertues, than beſides the general Meditation on *the* Birth, Death, Reſurrection *and* Aſcenſion *of our Lord every Lord's day*, to

ſet

ſet days apart for the particular Meditation on Each of theſe Grand Myſteries of our Religion: There being in each of them more than enough to employ a whole day in admiring thoughts of it, and in praiſes to God for it, and in making Applications of it to our Spiritual Advantage. And therefore I am certain, you would ſpend your pains to far better purpoſe, if inſtead of prejudicing Peoples minds againſt the obſervance of ſuch days, you would Excite them (like the good Fathers of the Primitive Church) to the *well* obſerving, and making the beſt improvement of them. The generality, God knows, of Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, are too too careleſly and irreligiouſly diſpoſed of *themſelves*, to need to be diſſwaded from the uſing of any helps to their being made more devout, and better People. And where there is *one* among us that is apt to be too *ſuperſtitiouſly* inclined, I fear there are ſome *hundreds*, who are more enclined to the other *Extreme*, that of *profaneneſs*. But our Author hath ſufficiently ſhewed, that the Popiſh Superſtitions are perfectly removed by our Church from the Obſervation of Holy-days. And no man that obſerves them as our Church directeth, can have the leaſt temptation from the Obſervance of them to be ſuperſtitious.

6. You ſay, *That to keep a day Holy to any Saint, is to make an* Idol *of that Saint.* And do you think our Church in her *Feſtivals*, deſigns keeping Days holy to *Saints*? if you do *not* think ſo, why are you thus impertinent? But if you do, then you declare that ſhe makes *Idols* of *Saints*. And if ſo, why did you *pag.* 17th declare it, as your belief, that the Church of *England cannot be juſtly charged with Idolatry*? But I think, that *the making an Idol of a Saint*, is idolatry.

7. You ſay, *That to keep a Day of Thanksgiving, for bleſſing the world with ſuch a Saint, is what God hath no where preſcribed; what neither the* Jews, *nor* Chriſtians, *in the*

the firſt times ever did. So that it ſeems you are not ſo ignorant, as you now ſeemed to make your ſelf; but, do know why many of our Feſtivals receive their names from certain Saints. And *why* may we not, on certain Days, meet together, to praiſe God for *bleſſing the world* with ſuch Saints, as have been next to our Bleſſed Lord, the moſt Glorious inſtruments of good to the world; and at the ſame time hear thoſe Chapters read wherein their worthy deeds are recorded; and together with *other* Prayers put in *one*, *for grace* to follow thoſe bleſſed Examples of a holy Life (of both active and paſſive Obedience) which *they* have, through the Divine grace, left behind them? What *Sin* is there in all *this*? Nay, why ſhould not this highly *become* us, and be of ſingular advantage to us?

You give *two* reaſons why this is unlawfull. 1. Becauſe *God hath no where preſcribed it.* But muſt we be at this time of day, told that nothing is lawfull relating to the Worſhip of God, but what is expreſly commanded; when the Idleneſs and Folly of that Doctrine, hath been over and over expoſed as it hath been? But 2dly you ſay, That *this is that which the* Jews, *nor* Chriſtians *in the firſt times never did.* But, if you mean by the *Firſt* times, the times of the *Apoſtles*, 'tis more than you can *prove*, that the Martyrdom of St. *Stephen* was never ſolemnly commemorated by the Chriſtians in *their* time. And I preſume you would not have had the Martyrdoms of the *Apoſtles* commemorated, *before* they were Martyred, what if this be not *recorded*, is it therefore a certain Argument that it never *was?* You find not I think the *Martyrdom* of any one of the Apoſtles recorded in holy Scripture, except St. *James*'s. But if you mean by the *firſt* times, the *Primitive* times, I perceive you never read, or have forgotten, *The Epiſtle of the Church of* Smyrna, concerning *Policarp*'s Martyrdom. But I hope it needs not

to

to be proved to you, that the Catholique Church obſerved *Martyrum Natalitia*, the Days whereon they were crowned with Martyrdom, even from the *Second* Century: But where do you find it preſcribed in God's word, or recorded that it was practiſed in the *Apoſtles* times (for to be ſure you mean *thoſe* by the *Firſt* times) to *praiſe* God for the good Examples of Holy men, among other great Bleſſings, is it therefore unlawfull ſo to doe, as well as to doe it upon *Set* Days? You will not aſſert ſo abſurd a thing. In ſhort, Sir, think not that we need either Precepts or Examples, to juſtifie our doing of that, which the very Light of Nature, and Right Reaſon, do plainly declare to us, to be, though not a *neceſſary duty*, yet highly *becoming* us, and *praiſe-worthy*. And we are certain that it is dictated thereby to be highly becoming us, to commemorate, at Annual Selected times, the unſpeakable Goodneſs of God to us in giving us ſuch Shining Lights as the *Holy Apoſtles*, &c. and to meditate upon Chriſt glorified in *them*, who with admirable *courage* firſt preached and propagated his Goſpel in the World, and with admirable *Patience*, for the ſake thereof, indured the greateſt of Miſeries and Calamities, and at laſt Sealed it with their *Blood*.

8. You ſay, *But if Devout perſons will ſet apart Days*, (you might have ſaid too, will *obſerve* Days ſet apart by the *Church*) *to give God thanks for any ſignal mercies* (among which I think, every Apoſtle is a moſt ſignal one) *or to put up Prayers for any people in diſtreſs, provided they do not mock God, in giving him an holy* hour, *inſtead of an holy* day, *and ſpend the reſt of the day in* Idleneſs, Gaming, Drinking, &c. (And can you think that any of our Devout people, do not abhor ſuch practices as much as you?) *Diſſenters will never blame, or condemn them for it.* I hoped you would have ſaid, they will *join* with us, ſince Authority requires it.

9. You

9. You ſay, *Finally Diſſenters will never ſeparate from the Church of* England, *for the true keeping of a day holy to God*, &c. Yes ſurely they will, if it be a *Saint*'s day at leaſt, as one would think by what you have ſaid. But you add, that *they will ſeparate from the Looſeneſs and commonly practiſed Profanation of it* (and ſo do thouſands of thoſe that are *no* Diſſenters, I hope) *or ſuch as were onely ſo, in the Pope's Kalendar, as St.* George, *&c.* Now you would, Sir, *again* feign your ſelf more ignorant than you are; for, no doubt, *you* know as well as *we*, that St. *George* his day is no *Church of England* Holy-day. And for all your [*&c.*] you cannot but know too, that *Our Church* hath no Feſtival-days called by any Saints names, but ſuch as all Chriſtians own for the *Greateſt* of Saints, except thoſe *Innocents* who had the honour to ſuffer for Chriſt's ſake, before they were of age to know him. We have indeed a *Faſt-day*, occaſioned by the Horrid Murther of *King Charles* the *Martyr*, whom we deſervedly honour as a Great Saint. But I never heard that this Saint ſtands in the *Pope's Kalendar*, and I'll warrant you never ſhall. We ſhould be glad to hear, that He ſtands in *yours*; however we hope He will never be blotted out of *ours*.

And now, having done with our Author, you ſpend a good part of your *five laſt* Pages in ſuch diſcourſe, as is ſo far from tending to the compoſing of our Differences, and healing our wide and moſt dangerous Breaches, that it hath the moſt apparent tendency to the making them irreparable beyond all Remedy. And 'tis enough to convince all ſober people, that the cauſe of thoſe that ſeparate is deſperate, to obſerve what ſtrange principles are taken up of late in the defence of Separation; even *ſuch* as the *Old Non-conformiſts* would have thought very *wild* ones, ſerving no better purpoſe than the Unhinging of all. And thoſe, Sir, which you here lay down ſo dogmatically,

matically not offering any *proof* of them, you ſhall find moſt ſhamefully baffled by the Dean of St. *Pauls*, in his forementioned excellent Book.

For *my* part, I am too much tyred with Scribbling *thus long*, to take into conſideration this *cloſe* of your Book, farther than reflecting upon *two* or *three* paſſages; though I am not *at all* obliged to take notice of *thoſe* neither, as a Defender of our *Author*. And *indeed* (to deal like a plain-hearted Friend with you) it was but *the other day* before I could be perſwaded to think it needfull to Reply *at all*.

You ſay, *pag.* 31. That Separation in theſe *three* Caſes is *Lawfull*, if not *Neceſſary*.

Your *Firſt* caſe is, *When ſuch errours are in the Conſtitution of a Church, as, if they had been known before, ought to have hindered Union with it.* But you do not tell us *what* Errours thoſe are. Would you have your Readers take it for granted, that there are *ſuch* Errours in the *Conſtitution* of the Church of *England*? But we may gueſs at *one* of thoſe Errours in our *Conſtitution*, from that which you ſay, *pag.* 30. *viz. That Governing Churches muſt have proper Officers, which cannot be, unleſs elected by the Governed; who could never part with their Right in chuſing Officers*, &c. But what Right they have you will ſoon learn from the Reverend Dean *Stillingfleet*, in his *Unreaſonableneſs of Separation*, pag. 307, *&c. There* you will find they have *no* Right at all, or I am much miſtaken. From what you ſay in theſe *two* Pages, and *that* which *follows* (in which your diſcourſe is ſuch, that 'tis hard to ſay *certainly* what you would be at) I ſhrewdly conjecture, that you believe it *Lawfull* to ſeparate from the Church of *England*, although ſhe had neither *Ceremonies* nor *Liturgy* to ſcare men away.

Your *Second* caſe is, *When a Church is turned Idolatrous*; that *then* it is neceſſary to depart from it. And *here* we have no Controverſie.

Your *Third* is, *When a Church will not admit a man's abiding in it, unleſs he will doe ſomething which his Conſcience tells him is ſinfull.* But, Sir, will you not acknowledge, that it cannot juſtifie our Separation that ſomething is required which we judge ſinfull, whilſt we will not impartially uſe all means for the duly informing of our judgments: whilſt we call it a running into Temptation, to read what is offered us in Defence of the Lawfulneſs of *that*, we have a prejudice againſt: Whilſt we ſo confide in *our own* judgments, or in the judgments of our *Party*, as not to bear to hear that 'tis poſſible we ſhould be miſtaken? Surely all truly good men will acknowledge *this.*

You ſay, *in all theſe Caſes Separating is* Lawfull, *if not* Neceſſary: *For in the two* firſt *Caſes we ought to Separate* (And then I hope in thoſe caſes it is *Neceſſary* and not onely *Lawfull* to Separate) *in the laſt we may prudently and warily depart*, &c. And why do you ſo *mince* the matter, by changing your phraſe, when your meaning is that you may *Separate?* And why do you ſo *mince* it too in ſaying, in the *two firſt* Caſes we ought to Separate? which ſuppoſeth that in *this* Caſe you are at your *Liberty*, and that, though you may *lawfully* Separate yet it is not a *neceſſary duty ſo* to doe. And why again do you ſay, we judge this no *ſinfull* Separation? Why don't you ſpeak *out* and ſay 'tis a *Neceſſary* one? Except you think that a man may lawfully act *againſt his Conſcience.* But you have given me ſufficient aſſurance in your Book, that this you do not think.

You ſay, *pag.* 33. *If any others in* former *Ages, or in our* own, *have had any other apprehenſions of the ſignificancy* (you would have ſaid *ſignification*) *of the Terms*, Church, Schiſm *and* Separation, *whom we own to have been Holy and Excellent men, till we ſee their Notions juſtified from* Holy Writ (*which alone can determine theſe things*) *we*

we muſt crave leave to diſſent from them, and believe that had they lived in our times, they would have diſſented from their own Apprehenſions under a more perfect light, &c. But

1. What would you have ſaid to *us*, if we had given this Anſwer to *your* citing *Holy* and *Excellent* men, ſuch as *Calvin* (whom our Author hath ſo often appealed to in his Book) and *others* againſt *our* Notions? I am ſure you would have ſeverely upbraided us with having a wonderfull opinion of our own judgments. Eſpecially if our Notions ran counter to all Antiquity, and the Judgments of all *Holy Excellent men* in former Ages, and to the generality of ſuch in our own Age and Time. But *this* I dare ſay may be aſſerted of *your* Notions concerning the Terms, *Schiſm* and *Separation*; and much of your talk concerning the Term *Church* too.

2. How came *you* to have more light than the Holy and Excellent men in former Ages, and in our *own* Age too? which you plainly ſuppoſe your ſelves to have. Nay you ſuppoſe *this*, as to multitudes of ſuch perſons alſo as are your *Contemporaries*. For you ſay, *pag.* 7. *We are far from thinking that there are not multitudes of Holy and Learned men, in our* Eccleſia Loquens, &c. that is, Among Conformable Divines of the Church of *England*.

3. This Anſwer would far better become the *Quakers* than *you*; *they* pretending to *inſpiration*, which *you* do not.

I will now conclude with a Remarque or two on thoſe words, with which you begin the concluding part of your Book.

You ſay, *pag.* 29: *And now how happy ſhould we not onely* think *our ſelves, but indeed* be, *would our Brethren but leave diſputing; how far it is lawfull for the* Spouſe of Chriſt, *to have Communion with the* Great Whore; *and onely argue how far we come ſhort of ſymbolizing with*

the First and Pureſt *Goſpel Churches, of which we have Records in Holy Writ.* To this I ſay

1. How Unaccountable is *this* Charge you lay againſt your Brethren! when you know that they are in as perfect a Separation as *your ſelves*, from the Communion of that Apoſtate Church, which you mean by the *Great WHORE.*

2. It lieth not in your power to ſhew us a Church, which more ſymbolizeth with the *Firſt and Pureſt Goſpel Churches*, than the Church of *England.* And as for *thoſe* Churches which you believe do come nearer to the *Firſt* and *Pureſt*, it hath often enough been demonſtrated with invincible ſtrength, that the *main* thing (*viz.* the point of *Government*) in which you conceive they more agree with *theſe* Churches, doth ſpeak them far *leſs* to agree with them, than the Church of *England* does: And ſpeaks them to be therein *unlike* to the whole Catholique Church of Chriſt for *fifteen hundred* years together, from the time of the *Apoſtles.*

We do not pretend that the Conſtitution of *our Church* is *abſolutely perfect*, we do believe that *ſuch* a Conſtitution is the *peculiar* privilege of the Church *Triumphant*; but we bleſs God that 'tis no more *imperfect*, and we who live in complete Communion with *this* Church are well aſſured that there is nothing either in the *Conſtitution* thereof, or in what is required thereby, that *hindereth* us from being as good Chriſtians as ever were in the world. We cannot find after all the pains that you and others have taken to prove the contrary, that there is impoſed upon us any one condition of Communion that does contradict any Law of God; that tends in the leaſt to the depraving of our Souls, to the gratifying of any *one* corrupt Affection, or the making us unmeet for the Heavenly Happineſs. And *this* our Holy *Martyrs* thought as well as *we*: And gave a *Demonſtration* hereof by their *Excellent Lives*, and *Heroick*

Heroick Behaviour under the greateſt *Torments*; they not onely *patiently* but alſo *joyfully* enduring them for the ſake of *Chriſt*. Nor do *we* find, any more than *they* did, that we are debarred by our Church of any Helps for the *building of us up in our moſt holy faith*. And whereas you expreſs ſuch mighty zeal for *Purer Ordinances*, we think *that* zeal would be much better employed in endeavouring after *Purer Hearts*: And that this contending with your *Superiours*, and your *Brethren* about ſome things enjoined, hath been infinitely more prejudicial to mens Souls, and contributed unſpeakably more to the impurity both of mens *hearts* and *lives*, than the impure Ordinances you ſo complain of. And therefore all *good* and *pious* Church of *England* men cannot but ſay, *How happy ſhould we not onely* think *our ſelves*, *but indeed* be, *would our Brethren but leave diſputing* with ſuch mighty concern about *little things*, and things that are perfectly harmleſs and innocent: Would make no more *Sins*, than God and their Bleſſed *Saviour* have made: Would be as fearfull of culpably *Diſobeying* Authority as of culpably *Obeying* it: Would be as *thankfull* that they are in no *worſe* Circumſtances, as they are *full of Complaints* that they are in no *better*: Would take as much pains to ſatisfie themſelves, how far they may lawfully hold *Communion* with our Church, as how far they may lawfully *Separate* from it: Would be as willing to read thoſe Books that are written in the *defence* of the things enjoined by our Church, as to read thoſe which are written in *oppoſition* to them: Would as impartially conſider the *vaſt diſtance* between *our* Church and that of *Rome*, as thus dwell upon the moſt *inconſiderable Agreement* that is between them; which our Author hath convincingly to any *unprejudiced* perſon proved, to be no juſtifiable pretence for Separation. And if we would well digeſt thoſe excellent words of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 14. 17, 18. *The Kingdom of God is not meat*

or

or drink, but righteouſneſs, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghoſt: For he that in theſe things ſerveth Chriſt, is acceptable to God and approved of men. And, if we would *follow after the things that make for peace, and things wherein one may edifie another.* And laſtly, if *we* would at length be perſwaded to *Let all bitterneſs, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil ſpeaking*, againſt one another, *be put away from us, with all malice:* And to be *Kind and affectionate one to another* (notwithſtanding the Difference of Apprehenſions) *tender hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Chriſt's ſake hath forgiven us.* I ſay, if we could once be brought to *this* temper, we ſhould be unſpeakably more happy, than thoſe things you expreſs ſo paſſionate a deſire of could poſſibly make us. And without *this* bleſſed temper, we ſhall be miſerable wretches, though there were no Agreement in any one *Rite* between *Rome* and *us*, and though our Ordinances were as *pure* as 'tis your wiſh to have them: Nor will our bidding the greateſt defiance to the Antichriſt in the *Roman Chair* one whit avail us, while the *Spiritual* Antichriſt, which is the worſe of the *two*, continues poſſeſſed of his Seat in our Hearts.

v. 19.

Eph. 4. 31, 32.

And ſo, Sir, I heartily bid you Farewell.

ERRATA.

Page 19. *Lin.* 12. read *in* their greateſt. *p.* 27. *l.* 30. dele ? *p.* 32. *l.* 1. read *is ſo contrived.*

FINIS.